

## HIGHER EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### Staff Summary

Phyllis Campbell, Dave Spangler, Libby Street, Denny Heck, Tim Stensager, Susannah Malarkey, Bernal Baca, Jim Bricker, Representative Don Cox, Steve Mullin, Chris Alejano, John Warner, Michael Miles, Representative Phyllis Kenney

Chair Denny Heck began the meeting with an overview of the agenda. He explained that the first purpose of the meeting was to receive NORED's presentation on the report entitled "Making the Grade: Washington Higher Education and the Global Challenge". Dr. Chance explained that the summary of the report highlights the main or macro ideas in the report. The report summary and full report are available at [www.washingtonlearns.gov](http://www.washingtonlearns.gov). Dr. Chance began by stating that Washington exists in an internationally competitive setting and need to think about education in that context. Global Challenge State (GCS) comparisons were used to establish benchmarks for where Washington is and needs to go. Comparatively, Washington is strong in a number of areas, but the ranking is largely due to a composition of people in the older age groups. Dr. Chance mentioned that we were indebted to Executive Director Ann Daley for examining social rate of return.

In NORED's presentation to the committee the following ideas were highlighted and further discussed by the committee. A more comprehensive list is available online. NORED recommended that the committee increase BA and graduate degree production to the average of the GCS, with priority to the **High demand** fields at both the BA and Sub-baccalaureate level. In response to this the committee asked how confident are we that we can move ahead on high demand? Bill responded that more information is needed about real student demand and take into account the employer piece. The SBCTC and HECB projects that the scientific and health fields have the greatest needs. It was further recommended that Washington increase capacity in needed fields through direct relationships with qualified independent institutions.

NORED's report further recommended aggressive outreach efforts to underserved students. The NORED report discussed a number of strategies to expand access and participation. Specifically, Dr. Chance proposed that the committee consider to at least double the **Opportunity Grant program** created by E2SHB 2630. He also highlighted **Indiana's 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholarship Program** and commented that Washington's early commitment program should be known as Washington 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars.

Dr. Chance also recommended a tuition waiver in which all students would be eligible for free tuition for their 13<sup>th</sup> year called the **Washington Opportunity Scholarship Program**. CC tuition rate waiver would apply to a two-or four-year college, private or public. It was noted that the Opportunity Scholarship program would facilitate

average students' movement through the pipeline. In addition this program would give the middle economic class something to feel good about in terms of higher education and its relevance to them. It was further noted that this scholarship would address the drop out associated with senior and junior years. It cautioned that the scholarship proposal was an expensive proposition and the question was raised whether it could be need based. There was concern expressed that scholarships took the pressure off the K-12 system and put it on the CTCs. A member of the committee reminded the advisory committee that their work does not stand alone and needs to be aligned with K-12 or else incentives would not work.

NORED's report characterized Washington as a moderate **tuition/moderate-aid state**. Virginia offers a model that should be employed here. Differentiated tuition for different tuitions was discussed. In addition, a performance agreement/accountability system was also discussed.

NORED's report also proposed **reconstituting the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB)**, with a transfer of management of the administrative functions to a separate Higher Education Coordinating Office. The proposal involved adding stakeholders to the HECB and affirming its purpose as a true higher education policy board. NORED's report proposed a **P-20 Council** formed as temporary entity with an initial life of five years. This would be the education version of the present GMAP program. In response to the proposed a member of the committee asked whether the proposed council would have regulatory authority? Not talking about statutorily investing authority, except through collaborative discussions and deliberations. Finally, the report proposed a **Budget Overlay** in the order of the chalkboard project in Oregon.

Following NORED's presentation Denny Heck outlined the task of the Advisory Committee which was to propose three to five big ideas which would be presented to the Steering Committee at the July 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. He asked staff to fill out our broad goals. After the July 10<sup>th</sup> meeting the Advisory Committee would have another opportunity to comment on Steering Committee's proposal. It was noted by a member of the committee that while NORED was not charged with costing out proposals, it might be helpful to understand whether something is substantial cost and whether something is of less cost. The Chair responded that the Advisory Committee would have at least an understanding of the estimated costs in ball-park form.

It was further raised that the committee should support a recommendation around research and development. While some assume that the science discovery fund is taking care of this, this does not push Washington State in the leadership quadrant. There were also members of the committee that expressed mixed emotions regarding supporting a research proposal. Particularly in light of the fact that the total number of research dollars large due to federal government.

It was noted that NORED's report is completely silent on apprenticeship. Dr. Chance mentioned that he would address this. There was a request for further RFP for high

demand. It was recommended that this be done in the form of a grant. Provide flexibility that comes with offering a grant. It was also requested that there be clarifying language where capacity exists (physical vs. capacity in classes). Finally, a member of the committee thanked Bill for putting faculty salary issues into the report. It was noted that faculty are willing to discuss accountability measures; faculty increases need to tie these to professional development and other goals.

The advisory committee then further discussed Opportunity Scholarships. A committee member further asked how the 13<sup>th</sup> year plays into dual credit programs? Dr. Chance responded that it applies to everyone. It was further noted that in principle a free 13<sup>th</sup> year seems great, there is concern regarding cost/benefit and whether it's the best use of state resources. There was also concern expressed that students are eligible that don't need the scholarship. A further question was asked whether the scholarship creates a disincentive for high achieving running start students? Dr. Chance stated that he factored the cost on were the number of entering students that did not bring credit into the system. There was concern expressed that this could unwittingly change the mission of the CTC system. Where do you draw the line on eligibility for the 13<sup>th</sup> year? Dr. Chance commented that all entering students that have no college credits would be eligible. Denny Heck observed that there was division on this idea. Questions were raised regarding input on cost figures (Opportunity Grants, Indiana Scholarship Programs, etc). Denny asked the committee not to filter ideas based on cost estimates yet.

The committee then discussed the issue of differential pricing rates as an incentive for students to take advantage of capacity. It was noted that the committee has not seen marketing research on the effects of differential tuition rates. State subsidy for comprehensive and branch campuses are the same. Some of our most expensive programs are on the branch campuses.

Dr. Chance noted that this issue has plagued researchers and there is no real answer. Branch campuses are an important part of the state's response.

The Chair also asked for further clarification regarding how student funding is higher at research institutions. A member of the committee was asserting that research institutions are not being funded at the level of the comprehensives. Need to get a clear answer to this.

The committee then reviewed and revised a proposal of "Big Ideas"—listing of programmatic examples to achieve the goal—put forward by the Chair. It was suggested by a member of the advisory committee that we may want to have five big levels highlighted research. Research is about Washington as a globally competitive state. It is a different goal. For a summary of the "Big Ideas" please see [www.washingtonlearns.gov](http://www.washingtonlearns.gov)

The committee then took public comment.

- Susie Wright, gave a summary of the Tribal Education Meeting in Omak, noting that many members of the Steering Committee and Advisory Committees' were in attendance. Ms. Wright mentioned that a MOA on implementation of agreement on tribal history was signed. She emphasized that the tribes employ over 25,000 members in WA State. Tribes are sovereign governance and have a broad spectrum of employment needs. The next tribal meeting is on August 22<sup>nd</sup>.
- Bryan Wilson, Associate Director, SWFB, cautioned the committee that just because WA ranks well in the production of CTCs, does not mean that WA is producing enough. We rely heavily on CTCs for academic transfer. Three mission areas must be examined: workforce training, academic transfer, and education and literacy. He mentioned that the report does not directly address workforce training. Joint report HECB and SWBF states we are only meeting 83% of demand; general shortage. Joint report called for general increase.
- Wendy , WEA/AFT Washington. Thanked committee for addressing the idea of faculty salaries and thanked NORED for addressing it in their report. However, the report left out inequities in salaries between part and full-time faculty and overuse of part-time faculty.
- Shauna, Workforce Council of King County, 1<sup>st</sup> goal should be to increase output in high demand fields. Core curriculum efforts particularly in the health care field. How a core curriculum effort might get more folks into the pipeline. Might want to consider adding students with limited English proficiency.

Ann Daley, Executive Director of Washington Learns, explained that the 5 big ideas would then be drafted in a memo to the Governor which will be shared on July 10<sup>th</sup>. The feedback from the Steering Committee will be brought back for the Advisory Committee on July 18<sup>th</sup>.